

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

DR

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/090,993	03/04/2002	Stanley G. Wright	01377-0001	8846	
75	90 01/13/2004	EXAMINER			
Michael C. Ba		COCKS, JOSIAH C			
	MHARDT, MORIARTY, Circle, Suite 3700	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Bank One Cente	er/Tower	3749			
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004 7		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1.2			_	, Cl					
•	(iii)	Applica	ition No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			,993	WRIGHT, STANL	WRIGHT, STANLEY G.				
			er	Art Unit					
		Josiah	C. Cocks	3749					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address Period for Reply									
THE - Extermination of the aftermination of the a	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUI nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cone period for reply specified above is less than thirty period for reply is specified above, the maximum are to reply within the set or extended period for repreply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no amunication. (30) days, a reply within the s statutory period will apply and ly will, by statute, cause the	event, however, may a reply tatutory minimum of thirty (30 I will expire SIX (6) MONTHS pplication to become ABAND	be timely filed i) days will be considered timel from the mailing date of this c ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on <u>27 October 2</u>	<u>003</u> .						
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL.	2b)☐ This action is	non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
5)⊠ 6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>11-17</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restricted.	are withdrawn from							
Applicat	ion Papers								
10) <u> </u>	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/ar Applicant may not request that any objected Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	e: a) accepted or ection to the drawing(s ng the correction is req	e) be held in abeyance. uired if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 C					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).									
a) 13)□ / s 3 a 14)□ /	□ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of 1. □ Certified copies of the priorit 2. □ Certified copies of the priorit 3. □ Copies of the certified copie application from the Internat See the attached detailed Office act Acknowledgment is made of a claim ince a specific reference was includ 7 CFR 1.78. 1) □ The translation of the foreign Is Acknowledgment is made of a claim eference was included in the first see	y documents have by documents have be sof the priority docuional Bureau (PCT Fion for a list of the confort domestic priority led in the first senter anguage provisional for domestic priority	een received. een received in Appl ments have been rec cule 17.2(a)). ertified copies not rec under 35 U.S.C. § 1 ce of the specificatio application has been under 35 U.S.C. §§	ication No ceived in this National ceived. 19(e) (to a provisional on or in an Application received. 120 and/or 121 since	al application) Data Sheet. a specific				
Attachmen				(mme 110) =	(A)				
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)			mary (PTO-413) Paper Not mal Patent Application (PT					

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt of applicant's amendment filed 10/27/03 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rogers* (US # 4,471,757) in view of *Gazille* (US # 5,575,275) and *Truran* (US # 4,280,475).

Rogers discloses in Figures 1-6 a method of burning similar to that described by applicant including a grate (19) for supporting a log wherein the grate includes legs extending downwardly therefrom (see Fig. 3) and an accessory (18) positioned on top of the grate (19), the accessory comprising two parallel elongate members (side members of 18) spaced apart by multiple connecting member (see connecting members on top and bottom of 18 in Figs. 1 and 2). The accessory functions to facilitate the even burning of a log so that substantially all of the log is consumed (see col. 1, lines 12-15). The examiner considers that a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably consider that because the accessory functions to cause substantially

Application/Control Number: 10/090,993

Art Unit: 3749

complete combustion of a log, the accessory is causing the log to burn for a longer time then would occur without the accessory.

In regard to claim 11 and the recitation of a synthetic firelog, it is well understood in the art that log supports in fireplaces may be used for both natural wood logs and synthetic logs.

Gazaille is cited to show a firelog support in the same field of endeavor as Rogers wherein

Gazaille explicitly notes that synthetic logs and ordinary wooden logs are equivalent imflammable materials for use in a fireplace (see Gazaille, col. 4, lines 10-14). Therefore, it would be have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the method of burning a log as disclosed in Rogers would be capable of use with a synthetic firelog as taught in Gazaille as these inflammable materials are well understood in the art to be equivalent means for generating a flame to be used as a heat source.

Rogers also does not specifically show that the grate (19) includes substantially parallel spaced bars for supporting a log. However, it is well known in the art that fireplaces grates are formed of substantially parallel spaced bars. Truran is cited to show this standard grate structure. Truran teaches a fireplace grate (10) and accessory in the same field of endeavor as Rogers wherein the grate of Truran includes parallel spaced bars (see Fig. 5)

Therefore, in regard to claims 11-17, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the grate of *Rogers* to include parallel spaced bars as shown in *Truran* as this structure is recognized in the art as desirable and conventional construction for supporting a log in a fireplace (see *Truran*, col. 2, 16-25).

Application/Control Number: 10/090,993 Page 4

Art Unit: 3749

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-10 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the accessory of *Rogers* increases airflow around supported logs and would therefore cause the logs to be burned in a shorter amount of time when using the accessory. However, such an argument is speculation on applicant's part that is not supported by the *Rogers* reference. *Rogers* notes that his accessory desirably functions to produce even burning such that a substantially all of a log will be consumed. The examiner considers that, while an increased airflow will be directed around logs supported on the accessory, the accessory will also function substantially identically to applicant's accessory in providing additional support for a log or firelog such that the log will not break up and fall through the grate. The examiner considers that this additional support will cause a log to burn for a longer period. Applicant also argues that Rogers would not be capable of use with a synthetic firelog. As noted above, the *Gazaille* reference is cited to further support the examiner's position that the natural wood logs and synthetic firelogs may be freely substituted for one another.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Josiah Cocks whose telephone number is

Application/Control Number: 10/090,993

Art Unit: 3749

(703) 305-0450. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus, can be reached at (703) 308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

jcc

January 8, 2004

JOSIAH COCKS PATENT EXAMINER Page 5

ART UNIT 3749